

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

REMARKS

The Office Action and prior art relied upon have been carefully considered. In an effort to expedite the prosecution, independent claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter. No new issues have been introduced.

Incidentally on page 1, paragraph 2 of the Office Action the Examiner states that claims 1 and 3-26 are pending. However, as correctly indicated in the remainder of the Office Action claims 1-26 are pending.

The following comments pertain to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Walker (U.S. Pat. No. 6,240,396) in view of Anderson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,209,095).

The Examiner's grounds of rejection described from the beginning of paragraph 5 to page 4, line 3 of the Office Action are exactly the same as those of the previous Office Action and do not properly take into account Points 1-10 raised in the previous response by applicant and repeated herein.

1. Concerning the feature "transmitting an account address and a demand for issuance from a user terminal unit to an issuer unit" specified in claim 1, the Examiner refers to Fig. 5C and corresponding descriptions at col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-4. It is not clear whether the Examiner regards the table 530 as corresponding to the account unit in the present invention.

The description from col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 4 of the Walker patent is only directed to the contents of customer table 530 which are provided by each customer (i.e. user) during the registration process. Fig. 5C shows information on each customer stored in a customer table 530. As explained at col. 5, lines 1-4, names and addresses are stored as part of the customer information, but such information has nothing to do with an account address which represents an address of the account unit where the user's electronic ticket is stored.

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

2. With respect to the feature "causing the issuer unit to transmit the demand for issuance to an account unit which corresponds to the account address" in claim 1, the Examiner refers to the Abstract and col. 7, lines 58-67 and col. 8, lines 1-62 of the reference. However, there is no disclosure of transmitting account address and demand for issuance to an issuer unit in the referred portions. Applicant is puzzled as to why the Examiner recites the Abstract which does not describe anything relating to the account address or the account unit of the present invention. The Abstract mentions purchase offers and acceptance, payment and a delivery of the ticket, but does not teach from where and to where the ticket is sent.

The description at col. 8, lines 26-62 relates to a process by which the user logs onto the system; and particularly mentions the case when the log on is the first time for the user, processes for registration and issuance of customer ID are performed as explained in the Remarks of the previous amendment.

3. With respect to the feature "to obtain a user identifier from the account unit", the Examiner refers to the same Fig. 5C and portions in the description as those referred to in paragraph 1 above. The customer table 530 certainly contains user identifiers but any process of obtaining user ID by the issuer unit is not suggested.

4. With respect to the feature "to prepare an electronic ticket inclusive of the user identifier", the Examiner refers again to the same portions of the description and Fig. 5C as those referred to in connection with the above paragraph 1. Fig. 5C is a customer table, but not a ticket. There is no suggestion of an issuer's preparing an electronic ticket.

5. Concerning the feature "to transmit the electronic tickets to the account unit through the communication network", the Examiner again refers to the same portions of the description as in paragraph 2 above. In the reselling system according to the Walker patent, the ticket number of a sold or purchased ticket is transmitted through the network, and the resold ticket is voided and assigned a replacement ticket number (col. 8, lines 15-19). In this connection, further explanation is given at col. 13, lines 47-55 that venue controller 400 creates the replacement ticket number and transmits it to a central controller 200 which, in turn, sends

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

the replacement ticket number to the customer as explained at col. 14, lines 13-19. That is, in the Walker reselling system, a ticket equivalent (ticket number) is created by the venue (i.e. issuer) and transmitted to the customer via the central controller and when the customer wants to use the ticket equivalent (ticket number), the customer prints the ticket number and takes it to the venue and uses it to gain access to the desired event (col. 14, lines 13-19).

It should be noted that the Walker system is a reselling system and the central controller deals with electronic information on the tickets to be sold or purchased, but does not deal with original tickets themselves which are supposed to be in a printed form on a piece of paper as can be interpreted from the descriptions at col. 12, lines 9-16, col. 13, lines 47-55 and col. 14, lines 13-22. For the sold tickets, the venue controller creates a replacement ticket number and sends it to the central controller (col. 13, lines 40-55).

6. With respect to the feature "causing the account unit corresponding to the user's account address to store the electronic tickets in a storage in said account unit", the Examiner refers to the same portions in the description as those referred to in the above paragraph 1, and specifically refers to customer ID in the table 530. However, the table 530 does not contain electronic tickets, nor does the Examiner clarify where the electronic tickets are stored, that is, the Examiner fails to show what part in the Walker system corresponds to the account unit in the present invention.

Further, in connection with the newly added limitation, the Examiner refers again to the same portions of the description as those referred to in the above paragraph 1, stating that customer database 530 maintains a plurality of records such as records 546, 548, each associated with a different customer. A customer registered in the customer table 530 may buy tickets or sell tickets or both. Customer table 530 stores a unique ID for each customer and name and address information in fields 534 and 536. However, the Examiner fails to show where those electronic tickets which were bought by customers are stored. In the Walker system, there is no device which is equivalent to the account unit in the present invention.

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

7. With respect to claim 3, the Examiner refers to the comparison by the central controller of received customer ID and information already stored in the table 530. This comparison is performed when a customer logs on to the system. Thus, the comparison has nothing to do with verification of validity of tickets performed in step (d) of claim 3.

8. With respect to the feature "causing the issuer unit to access the account address of the user upon receiving the demand for issuance" in claim 2, the Examiner refers to the same Abstract and portions of the description as those referred to in the above paragraph 2. However, in the Walker system, the venue controller (which is assumed to correspond to the issuer unit) simply sends a replacement ticket number (not ticket) to the central controller 200 and does not access to account address.

9. With respect to the feature "causing the accessed account unit to transmit a certificate of account address which guarantees a correspondence relationship between the account address assigned to the user and an identifier of the user of the account unit to the issuer" in claim 2, the Examiner refers to the description from col. 7, line 58 to col. 8, line 25. The referred portion explains that when a purchase offer is received, the central controller contacts a credit issuer to check if the buyer has valid credit, and when acceptance of the offer is received from a seller, the central controller contacts the seller's credit card issuer to check if the seller's credit is sufficient to cover a penalty for non-performance. The Walker patent does not teach the use of a certificate which guarantees a relationship between the account address of the account unit and an identifier of the user of the account unit.

10. With respect to the feature "causing the issuer unit to verify the certificate of account address and allowing it to use the identifier of the user contained in the certificate of account address as the user identifier upon successful verification", the Examiner refers to Fig. 5C and the description from col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 7. These portions of the descriptions relate to an explanation of the contents of customer table 630 among which are customer ID, name, address, and credit card number. There is no suggested use of any certificate of account address.

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

The Examiner's grounds for rejection described from the beginning of paragraph 5 to page 4, line 3 of the Office Action are exactly the same as those in the previous Office Action which we do not agree with, and we would like to repeat the same arguments as those in paragraphs 1-10 in the Remarks of the previously filed Response.

Applicant would like to emphasize that the issued electronic ticket is deposited in the account unit designated by the account address. In the Walker patent, there is no account unit for any user which stores electronic tickets issued to the user. For example, the offer table 550 shown in Fig. 5D stores ticket numbers 569, but not electronic tickets. In the Walker patent, only ticket numbers are dealt with among the resellers and buyers via the central controller 200 as explained in the previous Remarks.

Regarding the newly cited Anderson patent, Fig. 6 shows an example of electronic check 110 attached with an account certificate in which account number, payer's public key and bank's signature for the payer's public key are provided. However, there is no certificate which guarantees the relationship between the user ID and the account. According to the description at col. 28, lines 5-9, the electronic check includes a public key 134 signed by the bank holding the account with the bank's private key. The payer's public key is used to verify the payer's signature 126 (col. 26, lines 3-5).

In the Anderson patent, since there is no concept of providing account units on the network accessible with corresponding account addresses assigned to users having IDs, there is no concept of certifying the relationships between an account address and a user ID. That is, in the electronic check shown in Fig. 6, there is no account address because the user's account is created in the bank. The payee verifies the payer's signature 126 and the bank's signature 140 so as to check the validity of the electronic check.

In contrast, in the present invention, the account unit transmits to the issuer unit a certificate of account address which guarantees a correspondence between the account address assigned to the user and an identifier of the user. As defined in claim 1, the issuer unit verifies the certificate and creates an electronic ticket inclusive of the user identifier in step (d).

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Application No.: 09/588,350

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 20162-00557-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

11/1/04

Respectfully submitted,



By
Morris Liss, Reg. No. 24,510
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3425
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant